DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 545 EC 303 381

AUTHOR Flicek, Michael; Anderson, Jeffrey A.
TITLE A Continuum of Services within General Education for Students with Behavior and Emotional Disorders.
PUB DATE 3 Mar 94
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists (26th, Seattle, WA, March 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; *Behavior Disorders; *Delivery Systems; *Emotional Disturbances; Individualized Programs; Intermediate Grades; Mainstreaming; Models; Parent Attitudes; Prereferral Intervention; Program Development; Program Implementation; Referral; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Combined Classroom Model; Individualized Behavior Plans; Natrona County School District WY

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses two approaches to serving students at risk for or with emotional and/or behavioral disorders in general education settings: (1) use of individual behavior plans (IBPs), and (2) use of the combined classroom model. The process of developing an IBP is detailed, including when an IBP is developed, by whom it is developed, and the IBP development meeting. Criteria for contents and use of the IBP both before and after referral for special education are described as applied in the Natrona County, Wyoming, school district. IBPs are seen as both an intervention and an important part of the assessment process for these students. The combined classroom model (CCM) is used with intermediate grade students and involves combining students with and without disabilities and special and regular education staff (usually three teachers and three paraprofessionals) in one large classroom. Program components described include an integrated behavior management system, team driven classroom operation and functioning, a social skills component, and a mental health component. Responses of parents of students with either learning or emotional/behavior disabilities to the CCM have been positive. Responses of students (both with and without disabilities) are also given. Appended are a case study illustrating IBP use, parent and student satisfaction data and comments, and sociometric data. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 375 545

A Continuum of Services within General Education for Students with Behavior and Emotional Disorders

Michael Flicek
Natrona County Schools

Jeffrey A. Anderson
Natrona County Schools

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Flicek
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the 26th Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists. March 3, 1994. Seattle, WA.

Address all correspondence to Michael Flicek, 4731 E. 18th Street, Casper, WY 82609. (307)577-0253.

EC 303381

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Target Population

A. students at risk for being classified as having emotional or behavior disorders (E/BD)

B. students already classified as E/BD

Intervention Goal

To achieve educational outcomes which expand rather than diminish opportunities for these students (to borrow terminology from Reschly,1979)

We have come to see serving students with or at risk for E/BD classifications in general education settings, whenever possible, as consistent with the goal of expanding opportunities

A Problem with Self-Contained Services

Students with E/BD who were having success within self-contained classrooms were frequently, and admittedly (in many cases), self-sabotaging efforts to mainstream them by deliberately misbehaving.

Why did they want to remain in the self-contained class?

1. an increased feeling of security due to:
   a. high structure
   b. consistently enforced rules
   c. generous reinforcement

2. the students had become valued members of a class where the staff, and in many instances, other students, cared about them

3. with accommodation to the special class, membership status within the special class would become an important part of a student's self-identity -- in fact, without this accommodation, significant progress in the special class was unlikely to occur

Thus, successful accommodation within the self-contained class seemed to be both necessary for success in the self-contained setting and to be working against successful mainstreaming for many E/BD students (the catch 22)

We came to view success within the self-contained setting, however important this was, as insufficient in view of our goal to expand opportunities for these children

The successful functioning of students at risk for or with E/BD classifications within general education has become a high priority outcome goal which is currently directing our program development efforts

Purpose of today's presentation

To discuss 2 services which permit us to serve students with or at risk for E/BD classification in general education settings

1. Use of **individual behavior plans (IBPs)** for students at risk for E/BD classification

2. The **combined classroom model (CCM)** for students with E/BD classification

The development and implementation of IBPs

Formal IBPs are requested when the school behavior of a student is viewed as sufficiently challenging by some adult in his or her life - for example:

1. teachers
2. administrators
3. mental health counselors
4. parents

Formal IBPs are always developed as part of one of the following a formal processes:

1. school screening committee (SSC)
2. multidisciplinary assessment (MDA)
3. individual education plan (IEP) team meeting

Each of these three processes requires communication with the parent prior to the initiation of the process

Proposed IBPs are usually developed at an **IBP development meeting** (attended by school personnel including the school psychologist, who functions as a behavioral consultant - the parents usually do not attend this meeting)

The following things occur at the IBP development meeting:

1. **qualitative baseline information** is obtained (this is the gathering of evidence that an IBP is needed) -- information that is considered includes:
   a. reports from teachers, administrators, and other school staff to interview questions
   b. teacher's grade book data
   c. school and classroom discipline records (including office referral data)
   d. the student's school records
   e. other relevant data

2. a list of target behaviors is developed -- the functional impact of each target behavior is documented, including:
   a. impact upon the student's school adjustment and progress
   b. impact upon the instructional process in the settings where the behaviors are exhibited

3. a list of other interventions, both formal (e.g., counseling, social skills instruction, medication, remedial academic instruction) and informal (modifications and accommodations attempted by the classroom teacher), which have been attempted or which are currently in use are documented

4. a proposed IBP is developed and agreed upon - the proposed IBP must be acceptable to the classroom teacher

If the IBP is seen as part of a process which might eventually lead to the formal classification of the student as E/BD, then there is a minimum set of components which it must include

About 7 years ago a policy was developed and adopted by our District which requires the following prior to classifying a child as E/BD:

A written IBP must be developed and implemented for a minimum of 20 school days (exception: when safety risk associated with continued general education placement is unacceptable) and, in the assessment team's judgment, data collected during the time that the student is on the IBP supports the conclusion that the student ...

> "continues to exhibit significantly abnormal behavioral or emotional responses which adversely affect educational performance (including academic, social, vocational, and/or personal social areas student's behavior)"

Our District's policy is consistent with state rules and regulations -- it is the operationalization of the following statement from the rules and regulations:

> "Despite regular education interventions to modify behaviors, evidence shows the child continues to exhibit significantly abnormal behavioral or emotional responses which adversely affect educational performance, including academic, social, vocational, and/or personal social areas" (p. 24; 1992 revision)

The statement "Despite regular education interventions to modify behavior..." implies that identified students will be those who are **resistant to interventions**

Minimum criteria (components) for the written IBP include:

1. **target behaviors**
2. **reinforcers**
3. **consequences** (behavior reduction procedures)
4. **data collection procedures**

As such, district policy stipulates that failure on an IBP is a **necessary condition** for E/BD classification (with the one exception) -- this requirement allows for a direct measurement of a student's **resistance to intervention** prior to classification

Failure on an IBP is not a sufficient condition for E/BD classification, however, the following other criteria must be satisfied during the course of a multidisciplinary evaluation prior to an E/BD classification:

1. the student must have a severe pattern or patterns of problem behavior

2. which is/are chronic (has/have been present for at least a year)

3. and pervasive (present in a majority of school settings and during interactions with various school staff)

4. and which is/are having a negative functional impact upon the student's educational progress

Following the IBP development meeting another meeting is scheduled for the purpose of implementing the IBP

Participants at the IBP Implementation Meeting include:

- the teacher
- the administrator
- the parent(s)
- the school psychologist
- the student (with younger students or contentious parents, the student will often wait until the school staff and the parents have reached a tentative agreement on regarding the need for changes in the proposed plan)

The agenda for the implementation meeting includes:

a. present proposed IBP
b. discuss all areas of concern
c. make changes necessary to reach a consensus
d. discuss options which are being considered should the IBP fail (e.g., possible E/BD classification and a change in placement)
e. obtain signatures of all participants including the student (with checkmark for agree/disagree)

Other helpful IBP components include:

a. a list of the people who participated in the development of the proposed IBP

b. the name of the person who actually wrote the proposed IBP

c. the dates of the development meeting & implementation meeting

d. the date the IBP will be implemented

Case Study (Bill)

Concluding remarks regarding IBPs

IBPs are both an intervention & an important part of the assessment for students at risk for or with E/BD classification

Students are given an opportunity to <u>avoid</u> E/BD classifications and the more intrusive and restrictive interventions which often accompany such a classification

The Combined Classroom Model (CCM)

In the "combo class" several things have been combined:
- - students with and without disabilities
- - special education and regular education staff
- - 4th, 5th, & 6th grade students
- - 2 normal size classrooms into 1 large classroom

Classroom components:

1. Staff (3 teachers & 3 paraprofessionals)
   - - general education teacher
   - - resource teacher (1 paraprofessional)
   - - teacher of students with E/BD (2 paraprofessionals)

2. Students
   - - about 20 students without disabilities (4th & 5th grade)
   - - about 10 students with learning disabilities
   -- no more than 10 students with E/BD

   Classroom of choice for the students without disabilities

3. An integrated behavior management system

- - level system with 6 levels & 2 tiers
  - - levels 1 through 6 may be accessed by the students with E/BD (structure available to the student increases as the levels increase; i.e., level 1 & level 2 are the most structured)
  - - levels 3 through 6 may be accessed by students without disabilities and learning disabled students

- - guidelines for progress up and down through the levels are posted in the classroom and are based upon observable behavior

- - privileges and freedom progressively increase as students move up through the levels but more responsibility is required

-- an impulse control sequence of consequences is used to address problem behaviors which are not potentially harmful or excessively disruptive ... the impulse control sequence proceeds as follows:
   1. **reminder** (verbal cue that behavior is not acceptable)
   2. **reminder**
   3. **cool down** (5 minute time out from reinforcement in the classroom)
   4. **extended cool down** (10 minute time out from reinforcement in the classroom)
   5. **behavior conference** (an indepth discussion of preceding inappropriate behavior & identifying and role playing appropriate alternative behavior)
   6. **office referral** (a conference with the student, teacher, & principal ... goal is to return the student to the class as soon as possible)

-- on levels 1, 2, & 3 the impulse control sequence begins anew each hour (this approach allows students to retrieve themselves if they have problems during a given part of the school day)

-- on levels 4, 5, & 6 the impulse control sequence begins anew 4 times each day (following each recess)

-- staff promote the concept of choice with the students (for example, if a student behaves in a way that leads to a reminder, cool down, etc. that is his or her "choice" ... students are on particular levels by their own "choice" about how they behave)

-- examples:
  -- Level 1: visually and academically separated from rest of the classroom (portable dividers) and from the other students ... few privileges (isolated lunch & recess)
  -- level 6: designed for students with high internal impulse control ... extensive freedom & privileges, with responsible behavior required (students drop a level if they have just 1 cool down)

4. Team driven classroom operation and functioning

-- teacher team (<u>weekly meetings</u>)
  -- team leaders for curriculum content areas:
    - **general teacher** for math & science for all 4th grade students in the school;
    - **resource teacher** for 4th grade spelling & social studies for all 5th grade students in the school;
    - **resource E/BD teacher** for language arts, social skills, 5th grade spelling, & computers
    - **shared responsibility** for thematic, literature based approach to reading instruction

-- classroom team (teachers & aides; <u>weekly meetings</u>)

- - support team for students with E/BD students (monthly meetings with agenda which includes a review of the current status and issues of each student with E/BD in the class; access to support team expertise is more readily available for issues related to general students and students with learning disabilities than is the case within the traditional service delivery model)

  - - teacher team plus:
  - - school psychologist
  - - school social worker
  - - school nurse
  - - mental health counselor
  - - building principal
  - - district educational resource consultant
  - - other related services providers

support team recommendations assist classroom staff with decision making (i.e., the team, as opposed to the teacher or teachers, is accountable for the decisions which are made, which affords protection to the teachers as these challenging and potentially contentious decisions are addressed), for example:

- - modifying program to meet individual needs of students
- - referrals to outside agencies or professionals (e.g., Department of Family Services, medical consultation)
- - changes in behavior management program & input regarding other classroom issues
- - provide input regarding behavioral, emotional, & medical needs
- - re-evaluations, assessment issues, & IEP planning
- - parent support services
- - ongoing program evaluation services

5. Social skills component

- classroom goal: "that ALL students will come to see themselves as valued members of the combined classroom community as well as McKinley School."
- classroom motto:
  "With privileges comes responsibility"
- social skills instruction occurs at least 3 times per week
  - small groups (1 time a week for each grade level)
  - large group (2 times a week; social worker + teacher of E/BD 1 time a week & speech/language pathologist + teacher of E/BD 1 time per week)
- other activities which facilitate the social skills & community building
  - talk time (daily)
  - the "problem can"
  - weekly sensational student (selected by random drawing; brings a display for the classroom which tells about himself; leads talk time)
  - "teachable moments"
  - pod structure (level 4, 5, & 6 sit in work groups of 3 or 4 students)
- the classroom is designed to be a naturally occurring positive social skills experience

6. Mental health component

- counselor from the community mental health center
  - work with students with E/BD from 30 to 60 minutes per week at the school
  - regular contact with parents
  - a member of the classroom support team

The combo class is an example of true educational reform

- breaks down the traditional segregation of special and general education services & staff
  - general education students have access to special education resources and expertise & vice versa
- breaks down the traditional professional isolation among teachers at an elementary level
  - adult/adult professional interactions are increased, which impacts:
    - job satisfaction
    - accountability
    - adults model cooperation skills for students

How's the Combo Class working?

What Parents of the Students Without Disabilities Think

(see Table 1 & Appendix A)

- - all agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for their child or children in the future (13 of 17 parents strongly agreed)

- - all 17 indicated that discipline in the combo class was neither harsh nor lenient but just right (they also all indicated that their understanding of the disciplinary consequences used in the combo class was adequate to good)

- - 16 of 17 parents indicated that their child's attitude toward school was better

- - 14 of the 17 indicated that their child's academic performance and grades were better

- - One comment illustrated how the parent was aware of the impact of the behavior problem children in the class ... "My child has been scared at times when some of the kids with behavior problems get angry" ... this did not detract from the parents positive view of the program however as the parent strongly agreed that he or she would select the combo class for his or her child in the future.

- - Parent comments also revealed that the parents especially liked the amount of positive attention and support that was available to their children in the combo class.

What Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities Think

(see Table 1 & Appendix A)

- 6 of the 8 agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for their child in the future (the 2 others had no opinion)
- all 8 indicated that discipline in the combo class was neither harsh nor lenient but just right (they also all indicated that their understanding of the disciplinary consequences used in the combo class was adequate to good)
- 6 of 8 parents indicated that their child's attitude toward school was better
- 7 of the 8 indicated that their child's academic performance and grades were better

What Parents of Students with Emotional or Behavior Disabilities Think

(see Table 1 & Appendix A)

- 7 of the 8 agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for their child in the future (the 1 other parent strongly disagreed)
- 6 of the 8 indicated that discipline in the combo class was neither harsh nor lenient but just right (1 thought it was somewhat harsh and 1 thought it was somewhat lenient)
- 4 of 6 parents indicated that their child's attitude toward school was better (2 thought it was the same as the previous year)
- 1 of these parents commented that children with and without disabilities learn from each other - this parent noted that there were positives for both in the combo class

What the Students Without Disabilities Think

(see Table 2 & Appendix B)

- 20 of 21 agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for next year (17 strongly agreed, 3 agreed, and 1 had no opinion)

- 19 of 21 agreed that they were learning more than they did the previous year (the other 2 had no opinion)

- they generally expressed positive feelings about many aspects of the combined class including:
  a. having a lot of teachers
  b. working in a pod with other students
  c. how well they liked the components of the behavior management system
  d. how fair they felt the behavior management system was

- 24% admitted to having a lot of difficulty concentrating because of all the activities in the classroom

- 53% admitted to being bothered a lot by the way that some children in the combo class behave

- just 15%, however, admitted that it was very true that they sometimes wished that children with behavior problems were not in the combo class (45% indicated that this was not at all true)

- comments of the general students were typically very positive with many of them indicating that they liked their teachers and that they wanted to be in the combo class again

What the Students with Learning Disabilities Think

(see Table 2 & Appendix b)

- - 9 of 10 agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for next year (the other 1 had no opinion)

- - 8 of 10 agreed that they were learning more than they did the previous year (the other 2 had no opinion)

- - 8 of 10 indicated that the overall way they felt about themselves was better compared to the previous year

- - they generally expressed positive feelings about many aspects of the combined class including:
  a. having a lot of teachers
  b. working in a pod with other students
  c. how fair they felt the behavior management system was

- - 20% admitted to having a lot of difficulty concentrating because of all the activities in the classroom

- - 40% admitted to being very bothered by the way that some children in the combo class behave

- - 80% strongly disagreed, however, that the behavior problems of some children in the class bothered them so much that they sometimes wished those children were not in the combo class

- - comments of the resource students, like those of the general students, were typically very positive with many of them indicating that they liked their teachers and that they wanted to be in the combo class again

What the Students with E/BD Think

(see Table 2 & Appendix B)

- - 6 of 8 agreed that they were learning more than they did the previous year (the other 2 had no opinion)

- - they differed markedly from the general and resource students in many respects:

  a. they disliked many aspects of the behavior management system

  b. they felt that many aspects of the behavior management system were unfair

- - just 4 of 8 agreed that they would choose a class like the combo class for next year (2 had no opinion and 2 disagreed)

- - just 1 of 5 students with E/BD who commented had a totally positive comment

- - another 1 of the 5 admitted to liking the teachers (although he didn't want to be in the combo class)

What the Peers Think About Their Classmates with E/BD

(see Tables 3, 4, & 5)

- - 4 of 10 students with E/BD were rejected by peers while just 2 of the 31 students without E/BD was rejected

- - the most positive scores among students with E/BD on 8 of the 10 peer sociometric variables were average (i.e., the students with E/BD were, at best - with just a couple of exceptions - seen as average in their positive qualities on the behaviors which we assessed -- they were typically not seen by the peers as strong in the sense that they were high on positive behaviors or low on negative behaviors)

- - e.g., some students with E/BD were average in terms of how well they were known by their classmate, but none were "well known" by their classmates and 6 of the 10 were actually <u>not</u> well known (see tables 3, 4, & 5)

- - while just 1 of the 10 students with E/BD was uncooperative, the most cooperative any of them were was average (see tables 3 & 4; none were above average on the cooperative variable)

- - on 8 of the 10 variables the most positive score among the students without E/BD were twice as high as the most positive score among the students with E/BD (the exceptions were that a student with E/BD was least disruptive and another was least likely to start fights; see tables 3 & 4)

- - all but 2 of the students with E/BD were seen as "shy" (student I; the least shy of the students with E/BD was not deviant on any of the 10 variables)

- - the most popular among the students with E/BD was an older student (grade 6) who was very low on disruption and high on comedian (student I; this student was physically more mature than all students in the class)

- - the treatment task for student B appears especially formidable as this student was seen by peers as deviant on 9 of 10 sociometric variables (see table 3 & 5)

- - regardless of the positive views held by parents and students about the combo class, the sociometric data clearly illustrate how formidable the task of helping the students with E/BD to truly fit in socially with their peers will be

- - more intensive small group social skills and peer relationship interventions, which focus upon the replacement of behaviors negatively sanctioned by peers with positive behaviors, are in the planning stages

Addendum A

Case Study of a Case where an IBP was Used

Table 1.

Case Study Involving the Use of an Individual Behavior Plan

Bill

Background.

Bill entered Washington Elementary to begin the new school year as a 4th grade student. He attended a school in another community during the previous school year. He was living with both natural parents and 2 younger siblings.

Qualitative Baseline Information.

During the first week of the school year Bill was referred for counseling and he was referred to the School Screening Committee (SSC). The reasons for these referrals were listed on the forms as, "noncompliant, cries, disruptive, very emotional, shouts at teacher, stomps, won't answer teacher, doesn't like to answer in front of class, hits himself on the head, and seems very frustrated daily". By the end of the first month of school the parents had been asked to remove Bill from school on 3 different school days. On each of these days Bill was removed from class due to, "a high level of agitation, crying, screaming, holding his breath, and kicking the desk". The parents reported that similar behaviors were present and were ineffectively handled by school officials during the previous school year.

Action of the School Screening Committee.

The SSC consisted of the two 4th grade teachers, and the building principal. The school psychologist was asked to serve as a consultant to the SSC. At the first SSC meeting, held at the end of the first month of school, the team (a) developed an IBP (see Appendix A) and (b) agreed to recommend a comprehensive evaluation. SSCs at Washington Elementary typically would not recommend evaluations until after an IBP was attempted for several weeks. In this case, however, because the frequency and severity of the problem behaviors were so extreme, the SSC members were pessimistic that the IBP would help. By initiating the evaluation immediately, a placement in special education, if warranted, would be expedited. One week later a second SSC meeting was held with Bill and his parents in attendance. All parties in attendance, including Bill, signed the written IBP and agreed that it should be implemented that same day.

Findings of Multidisciplinary Assessment.

Mental Ability Testing. During mental ability testing, Bill's facial expression suggested that he was very sad and agitated. He seemed on the verge of tears although he did not cry. Bill would not elaborated upon verbal responses, regardless of the encouragement that was offered. He simply shrugged his shoulders. Bill performed very slowly on the timed Performance Scale items. Bill ultimately obtained a Full Scale IQ score of 67 on the WISC-III, which was judged by the examiner to be invalid.

Academic Skills Testing. Bill's behavior and effort were judged by the resource teacher who administered the Woodcock Johnson - Revised to be appropriate. Bill

earned the following standard scores based upon age norms: Broad Reading = 99, Broad Math = 88, Broad Written Language = 88, and Broad Knowledge = 92. The classroom teacher reported that Bill was earning Cs and Bs in class by late November.

Problem Behavior Ratings. Appropriate versions of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) were completed by each of Bill's parents and by his classroom teacher. The profiles that resulted from all 3 CBCLs revealed significant Internalizing problems (T scores from 74 to 77). There were significant concerns on the narrow-band factors labeled Anxious/Depressed (T scores from 77 to 79) and Withdrawn (T scores from 68 to 75). Parent ratings did not reveal any other areas of concern. On the profile that resulted from the teacher's rating, the Externalizing T score was 65 and the Aggressive Behavior T score was 67. The highest T score on the profile from the teacher's rating was an 85 on Thought Problems. On that factor, the teacher indicated that Bill was obsessed (e.g., saying "I can't do it" to academic tasks), tried to harm himself (e.g., head banging), repeated acts over and over (e.g., shaking hand, kicking desk, banging head), had strange behavior (e.g., holding breath until he turns red and his body shakes) and had strange ideas (e.g., that others are always mad at him). Scores on the Attention Problems factor were within a normal range on profiles of ratings completed by all 3 raters.

Self-rating. On the Reynold's Child Depression Scale, Bill's raw score was 61 which converted to a percentile rank score of 72.

Student Response to the IBP. During the first day on the IBP, Bill received a warning for behavior contrary to one of the target behaviors. Upon receiving the warning, Bill, as was his pattern, became increasingly agitated and disruptive. Bill did not comply with the time-out so the teacher sent for the principal who escorted Bill to the office for an out-of-class isolation (OCI). Once at the office, Bill calmed down within 10 minutes. Bill then served a 5 minute time-out in the classroom and did not receive any more warnings for the remainder of the day. This was the first time that Bill calmed down enough to return to class after being sent to the office. During the next 8 days Bill did not receive a single warning. On the 9th day, Bill again became noncompliant to the point that an OCI was implemented. He calmed down once in the office and successfully served a time out in the classroom. Bill then had 21 consecutive days without even a warning.

Assessment Team Conclusions and Recommendations. Bill was not identified as a student with an educational disability. Mental ability testing was not valid. Regardless of the obtained IQ, Bill was achieving average or better grades in class and his behavior was well controlled with the use of the IBP. Recommendations included: (a) continue in counseling to address the internalizing problems, (b) continue on the IBP to address the disruptive and noncompliant behaviors, and (c) share assessment and treatment information with Bill's physician to assist with medical management issues.

Follow-up.

In November, the physical education instructor reported that Bill was crying and refusing to try during class. The IBP was revised to address Bill's behavior in physical education class. Two weeks later, the physical education instructor reported that Bill's behavior was no longer a problem in that setting.

By March 23rd of that school year Bill had gone for 93 school days in a row without so much as a warning. At Bill's request, the teacher discontinued the IBP on that date

and placed Bill back on the regular classroom discipline plan (this was established as the goal for Bill when the IBP was initially implemented). While on the regular discipline plan Bill did have his name placed on the board for a rule violation on one occasion. The teacher reported that Bill became teary-eyed when this happened and it looked for a moment as if Bill might lose control. Instead, he pulled himself together and accepted the discipline appropriately. Bill was not on any psychotropic medication during that initial year in his new school district.

At the end of the first half of the following school year, Bill has successfully remained on a regular school and classroom discipline plan. He continues to receive 30 minutes per week of counseling. He appreciates and seems to need the support offered by the counseling. He is struggling academically, and a re-evaluation is being contemplated to address suspected learning problems. The counselor is working on preparing Bill to be relaxed, cooperative, and motivated during the evaluation. Bill was placed on imipramine in October to address depression. The mother reported to the counselor that both behavior and mood were improved at home after the imipramine was initiated.

Individual Behavior Plan

Student: BILL
Grade: 4
School: Washington Elementary
Teacher: Ms. Billings
Date Plan Implemented: September 30

Target Behaviors

1. Bill will follow with instructions given by staff members without crying or arguing.
2. Bill will speak in an appropriate, calm voice when he has permission to speak.
3. Bill will be in his assigned school and classroom location (he will raise his hand when he needs assistance).

Reinforcers

1. Bill may earn a sticker for each 1/4th day that he successfully avoids time-outs and isolations by choosing to comply with the target behaviors (school days will be divided by the 3 recesses).
2. Bill may earn a *Good Behavior Award* each day that he successfully earns all possible stickers.
3. Parents are encouraged to reinforce Bill with a special interactions or activities at home on days when Bill brings home a *Good Behavior Award.*
4. When Bill has 3 good days in a row he will be permitted to make a selection from the classroom seashell bucket.

Consequences

1. The first time that Bill engages in a behavior contrary to the target behaviors listed above will result in a **warning** (W).

2. The second time that Bill engages in a behavior contrary to the target behaviors listed above will result in a five minute **time-out** (TO).

Note. Warnings and time-outs will recycle following each recess.

3. If Bill engages in a behavior contrary to the target behaviors listed above during the same 1/4th day that a time-out has already been issued, then an **out-of-class isolation** (OCI; school office) will be implemented.
   - An OCI will also be implemented if Bill engages in a behavior contrary to the target behaviors listed above while he is in time-out.
   - During the OCI, Bill will be given approximately 10 minutes to "cool down". After about 10 minutes the principal or principal's designee should script Bill on the rules. If Bill responds calmly and appropriately during the scripting, he should then be asked if he is ready to return to class and follow the rules. If Bill says, "yes", he may be escorted back to the time-out location in the classroom where he will serve a time-out before being allowed to join the class activity.

4. An **Isolation-at-Home** for the remainder of the school day will be implemented under the following conditions:
   a. if the Bill does not respond calmly and appropriately to the scripting following an OCI or if he indicates that he is not ready to return to class and follow the rules following the scripting.
   b. any further occurrence of behavior contrary to the target behaviors exhibited by Bill which lead to a second OCI.
   (In other words, only one OCI will be permitted each school day. The second time in any school day that the plan calls for an OCI, Bill's parents will be contacted and they will be asked to pick Bill up from school from the school.)
   c. if an isolation at home is implemented during the afternoon, the principal may ask that Bill wait until noon on the following day to return to school.

Playground. The regular school plan will be in effect, including the use of citations.

Music. One warning will be permitted and then an OCI will be implemented.

Addendum (date: Nov. 25). In physical education class, Bill will receive 1 warning and then an OCI will be implemented.

Data Collection

A record will be kept of each good day and each warning, time-out, OCI, and isolation-at-home, and the behaviors that led to each of these consequences.

Additional Procedures

Rules, consequences, and reinforcers will be "scripted" with the student on a daily basis. The rules will be posted on the student's desk at all times. At the beginning of the program, each teacher should demonstrate appropriate time-out behavior and have the student practice that behavior.

Proposed plan developed by:

Proposed plan development date: Sept. 23

Proposed plan written by: Mike Flicek

Date of implementation meeting: Sept. 30

Meeting participants:

Name	Position	Agree	Disagree
_____	Student	XXX	____
_____	Mother	XXX	____
_____	Father	XXX	____
_____	Teacher	XXX	____
_____	Principal	XXX	____
_____	School Psych	XXX	____

Script

Rules

1. Do what I'm told
2. Be quiet & speak in a calm voice
3. Be in place

Reinforcers

1. Four stickers
2. Good behavior award
3. Home activity
4. Seashell selection

Consequences

Warning -- Time-out -- Out-of-Class -- Home

Addendum B
Parent Satisfaction Data Regarding the Combination Class

Table 1. Frequency distribution of parent responses to parent questionnaire based upon child's status[a]

Item	Child's Status	Parent Responses				
		much better 1	2	same as 3	4	much worse 5
1. Compared to last year, my child's attitude toward school this year is:	general	11(65%)	5(29%)	1(6%)	0	0
	resource	5(63%)	1(12%)	2(25%)	0	0
	E/BD[b]	3(50%)	1(17%)	2(33%)	0	0
2. Compared to last year, my child's performance and grades in school this year are:	general	7(41%)	7(41%)	2(12%)	1(6%)	0
	resource	4(50%)	3(38%)	0	1(12%)	0
	E/BD	2(33%)	0	3(50%)	1(17%)	0
3. Compared to last year, my child's behavior in school this year is:	general	6(35%)	5(30%)	6(35%)	0	0
	resource	3(37%)	2(25%)	3(37%)	0	0
	E/BD	2(33%)	2(33%)	1(17%)	1(17%)	0
4. Compared to last year, my child's behavior at home is:	general	4(24%)	3(18%)	10(59%)	0	0
	resource	1(12%)	4(50%)	3(38%)	0	0
	E/BD	0	4(67%)	2(33%)	0	0
5. Compared to last year, my child's peer relationships are:	general	2(13%)	4(25%)	9(56%)	1(6%)	0
	resource	3(37%)	3(37%)	2(25%)	0	0
	E/BD	1(16%)	4(67%)	1(17%)	0	0
		too harsh 1	2	just right 3	4	too lenient 5
6. My perception of discipline in the combo class is that it is:	general	0	0	16(100%)	0	0
	resource	0	0	8(100%)	0	0
	E/BD	0	1(12%)	6(75%)	1(12%)	0
		poor 1	2	adequate 3	4	good 5
7. My understanding of the use of reminders and cool downs in the combo class is:	general	0	0	5(29%)	4(24%)	8(47%)
	resource	0	0	2(25%)	2(25%)	4(50%)
	E/BD	0	0	1(12%)	2(25%)	5(63%)

8. My understanding of the level system used in the combo class is:	general	0	1(6%)	2(12%)	7(41%)	7(41%)
	resource	0	1(12%)	3(38%)	1(12%)	3(38%)
	E/BD	0	0	1(12%)	1(12%)	6(75%)
		not at all 1	2	some 3	4	a lot 5
9. My child has commented on being distracted by all of the activities going on in the combo class:	general	11(65%)	5(29%)	1(6%)	0	0
	resource	6(75%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	0	0
	E/BD	5(63%)	2(25%)	0	1(12%)	0
		is detrimental		is just different		is beneficial
10. Compared with a traditional class with just 1 teacher, having a team of several certified teachers and other adults in the combo class:	general	0	0	0	2(12%)	15(88%)
	resource	0	0	1(12%)	2(25%)	5(63%)
	E/BD	0	1(12%)	0	1(12%)	6(75%)
		strongly disagree 1	2	no opinion 3	4	strongly agree 5
11. My child has benefited from being educated in a setting where special needs children are included:	general	0	0	2(12%)	3(18%)	12(71%)
	resource	0	0	3(37%)	0	5(63%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	0	1(12%)	2(25%)	4(50%)
12. I would choose a class like the combo class for my child or children in the future:	general	0	0	0	4(24%)	13(76%)
	resource	0	0	2(25%)	1(12%)	5(63%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	0	0	1(12%)	6(75%)

[a]Values in table are frequencies and percentages (in parenthesis). [b]E/BD = emotional/behavior disorder.

Transcript of Parent Comments on the Combo Class Parent Questionnaire (1/94)

General comments in response to: "Please describe any other feelings that you have regarding the combined class on the reverse side of this questionnaire". Code for the numbers in parentheses are as follows: 1 = parent of a general student, 2 = parent of a resource student, & 3 = parent of an E/BD student.

0009 I believe the overall benefit to students in all areas, both educational and social, is great. I hope McKinley School can continue to offer this choice in the future and wish my child had another year to look forward to. (1)

0012 It has been wonderful for my son's self-esteem and he is becoming even more compassionate and caring. He obviously gets more one-to-one attention that ever in the past. (1)

0020 I think the combo class is great - my daughter can't say enough good things about it or the teachers. Her grades and attitudes have changed dramatically for the best. Please keep the combo class. (1)

0023 My child has been scared at times when some of the kids with behavior problems get angry. (1; checked response 5 to item 12)

0024 My child has expressed concern about getting reminders in front of the other children. It makes him feel embarrassed. (1; checked response 3 on item 6 and response 5 on item 12)

Other comments.

0007 Marked response 4 on item 2 and noted: "not class related". (1)

0009 Marked response 1 on item 9 and noted: "He does like to tell me the "different" things that go on but it doesn't distract him". (1)

0013 Marked response 3 on item 9 and noted: "Commented on other kids being angry and knocking things over". (2)

Marked response 3 on item 11 and noted: "Socially - yes. Academically - not sure yet." (2)

0032 Left item 6 unanswered and noted: "unsure". (1)

0033 Left items 1 through 5 unanswered and noted: "I didn't have my child last year".

Responses on Item 13: "Describe in your own words the type of special needs children served in the combo class".

0001 Her attitude has been greatly improved. (1)

0004 Support!! The children receive positive support. (1)

0005 Individual attention - excellent incentives. (1)

0007 Individual needs can be more appropriately addressed. (1)

0008 Children just need a little more support sometimes and thanks to the combined class they get it. (2)

0009 More attention to each student - experience with different teaching styles and with different personalities of students and teachers. (1)

0010 One-on-one with teachers help when needed before it becomes a real problem. (1)

0012 Behavior problems, emotional problems, peer relationships. (1)

0013 Children who need modified reading programs because "traditional" teaching methods aren't effective. (2)

0016 For the children with the inability to get along with other children on a normal level. It gives them the opportunity to learn to cohabit with supervision. (3)

0017 Kids who have a hard time with peers and authority. (3)

0018 More one-on-one with the child and teacher. (3)

0023 Kids with behavior problems are taught social skills to learn appropriate behavior. (1)

0024 Kids with behavior problems are taught what appropriate behavior is. (1)

0025 Attention! Attention! Attention!

0028 I love the one-on-one contact she gets when she needs extra help. I really appreciate it. (2)

0029 I like (my child [being]) in the combo class. She feels a lot better about trying, where, she knows she isn't the only one with troubles. (2)

0032 Behavior and peer association problems. (1)

0033 Behavior problems. (3)

0034 Children of varying disabilities are placed with children of normal patterns - they each learn from each other - there are positives both in this system. (3)

Addendum C
Student Satisfaction Data Regarding the Combination Class

Table 2. Frequency distribution of student responses to student questionnaire based upon student's status[a]

Item	Student's Status	Student Responses				
		a lot more 1	2	the same 3	4	a lot less 5
1. Compared to last year, I like school this year:	general	11(55%)	4(20%)	4(20%)	0	1(5%)
	resource	6(60%)	2(20%)	2(20%)	0	0
	E/BD[b]	2(25%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	1(12%)	1(12%)
2. In school, comparing this year to last year, I am learning:	general	13(62%)	6(29%)	2(10%)	0	0
	resource	6(60%)	2(20%)	2(20%)	0	0
	E/BD	3(37%)	3(37%)	2(25%)	0	0
3. In school, comparing this year to last year, I am staying out of trouble:	general	7(35%)	0	8(40%)	2(10%)	3(15%)
	resource	2(20%)	1(10%)	6(60%)	0	1(10%)
	E/BD	3(38%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	2(25%)
		a lot worse		about the same		a lot better
4. In school, comparing this year to last year, I am getting along with the other kids:	general	2(10%)	1(5%)	10(50%)	2(10%)	5(25%)
	resource	0	0	3(30%)	1(10%)	6(60%)
	E/BD	0	1(12%)	1(12%)	3(38%)	3(38%)
5. In school, comparing this year to last year, I am getting along with my teachers:	general	0	1(4%)	10(48%)	0	10(48%)
	resource	0	0	4(40%)	0	6(60%)
	E/BD	2(25%)	0	2(25%)	2(25%)	2(25%)
6. Comparing this year to last year, I am getting along with my parents:	general	2(10%)	0	11(52%)	1(5%)	7(33%)
	resource	0	0	6(60%)	0	4(40%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	0	1(12%)	2(25%)	4(50%)
7. Comparing this year to last year, the overall way that I feel about myself is:	general	2(10%)	0	5(25%)	1(5%)	12(60%)
	resource	0	0	2(20%)	1(10%)	7(70%)
	E/BD	1(12)	0	3(38%)	1(12%)	3(38%)

		I like it better 1	2	no opinion 3	4	I like it worse 5
8. How do you like having a lot of teachers instead of just one?	general	16(76%)	3(14%)	1(5%)	0	1(5%)
	resource	7(70%)	2(20%)	1(10%)	0	0
	E/BD	4(50%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	1(12%)

		I like it a lot 1	2	no opinion 3	4	I don't like it 5
9. How do you like working in pods in the classroom?	general	15(75%)	1(5%)	2(10%)	0	2(10%)
	resource	8(80%)	0	2(20%)	0	0
	E/BD	3(38%)	1(12%)	4(50%)	0	0
10. How do you like having more than one grade level in your class?	general	10(50%)	5(25%)	4(20)	0	1(5%)
	resource	8(80%)	0	1(10%)	0	1(10%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	4(50%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	1(12%)
11. How do you like the level system?	general	12(60%)	4(20%)	1(5%)	1(5%)	2(10%)
	resource	5(50%)	1(10)	3(30%)	1(10)	0
	E/BD	0	2(25%)	1(12%)	3(38%)	2(25%)
12. How do you like the use of cool downs?	general	11(52%)	1(5%)	5(24%)	0	4(19%)
	resource	1(10%)	0	6(60%)	0	3(30%)
	E/BD	0	1(12%)	0	4(50%)	3(38%)
13. How do you like the use of extended cool downs?	general	8(40%)	2(10%)	5(25%)	1(5%)	4(20%)
	resource	2(20%)	1(10)	5(50%)	0	2(20%)
	E/BD	0	1(12%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	5(63%)
14. How do you like the use of reminders?	general	10(50%)	4(20%)	3(15%)	3(15%)	0
	resource	6(60%)	1(10%)	1(10%)	0	2(20%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	1(12%)	2(25%)
15. How do you like the use of point charts?	general	9(45%)	0	7(35%)	1(5%)	3(15%)
	resource	2(20%)	1(10%)	5(50%)	1(10%)	1(10%)
	E/BD	1(12%)	2(25%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	3(38%)

		very unfair 1	2	3	4	very fair 5
16. How fair do you think the level system in the combo class is?	general	0	0	5(24%)	3(14%)	13(62%)
	resource	1(10%)	0	1(10%)	1(10%)	7(70%)
	E/BD	2(25%)	1(12%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	1(12%)
17. How fair do you think the use of cool downs in the combo class is?	general	3(14%)	1(5%)	1(5%)	1(5%)	15(71%)
	resource	1(10%)	1(10%)	1(10%)	3(30%)	4(40%)
	E/BD	3(38%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	1(12%)	0
18. How fair do you think the use of extended cool downs in the combo class is?	general	2(10%)	1(5%)	6(29%)	1(5%)	11(52%)
	resource	1(10%)	0	1(10%)	1(10%)	7(70%)
	E/BD	3(37%)	2(25%)	3(37%)	0	0
19. How fair do you think the use of reminders in the combo class is?	general	0	0	2(10%)	1(5%)	18(86%)
	resource	1(10%)	0	2(20%)	0	7(70%)
	E/BD	2(29%)	2(29%)	2(29%)	0	1(14%)
20. How fair do you think the use of point charts in the combo class is?	general	4(19%)	1(5%)	3(14%)	2(10%)	11(52%)
	resource	1(10%)	1(10%)	2(20%)	1(10%)	5(50%)
	E/BD	2(29%)	1(14%)	2(29%)	2(29%)	0

		very true 1	2	sometimes true 3	4	not at all true 5
21. Sometimes I have trouble concentrating because there are so many things going on in the combo class. This statement is:	general	3(14%)	2(10%)	10(48%)	1(5%)	5(24%)
	resource	1(10%)	1(10%)	7(70%)	1(10%)	0
	E/BD	2(25%)	2(25%)	3(38%)	0	1(10%)
22. Sometimes other children in the combo class behave in ways that bother me a lot. This statement is:	general	10(48%)	1(5%)	4(19%)	2(10%)	4(19%)
	resource	4(40%)	0	4(40%)	0	2(20%)
	E/BD	2(25%)	1(12%)	1(12%)	2(25%)	2(25%)
23. There are children in the combo class whose behavior bothers me so much that I sometimes wish they were not in the combo class. This statement is:	general	2(10%)	1(5%)	5(25%)	3(9%)	9(45%)
	resource	0	1(10%)	1(10%)	0	8(80%)
	E/BD	2(25%)	0	1(12%)	2(25%)	3(38%)

		strongly agree 1	2	no opinion 3	4	strongly disagree 5
24. If it was my choice, I would choose a class like the combo class to attend again next year:	general	17(81%)	2(10%)	1(5%)	0	1(5%)
	resource	9(90%)	0	1(10%)	0	0
	E/BD	2(25%)	2(25%)	2(25%)	1(12%)	1(12%)

[a]Values in table are frequencies and percentages (in parenthesis). [b]E/BD = emotional/behavior disorder.

Transcript of Student Comments from the Combo Class Student Questionnaire (2/94)

General comments in response to: "Please describe any other feelings that you have regarding the combined class in the space below". Code for the numbers in parentheses are as follows: 1 = a general student, 2 = a resource student, & 3 = an E/BD student.

001 Combo class is cool! (1)

002 The combo class is a very good class - I'de like my kids to be in the combo class. (1)

003 that it was a good class and we do a lot of fun things and have fun whith freinds (1)

004 I don't think total noncomplance shouldn't be an automatic cool down. (1; checked response 3 on item 12 and response 2 on item 17)

005 My feelins are that this class has got me strait "As". (1)

006 I think the combo class is a very good idea (1)

007 My teachers are great (1)

008 I like the class & I've been getting better grades & the teachers are really nice. (1)

010 I feel that the c.c. is the best class ever!!! (1)

011 I like my teachers (1)

012 P.e. is too small and crowded. (1)

013 I am happy in the combo class (1)

014 I feel my teachers are nice and cool (1)

015 I like the c.c. class because it makes me feel at home. (1)

016 I think this class is great. I have made more friends this year than I have any other year. (1)

017 I like it alot ... I want to be in it next year (1)

018 I love the class that I am in. (1)

020 O.K. (1)

021 Sometimes people next to me are sometimes fair but I want a new rule like everyone has to be a fair participant. (2)

022 I have alot ove feelens for the combo class ... thank you. (2)

023 I like this class a lot. (2)

024 Nothing els to share. (2)

026 This class is cool because the teachers are nice (2)

027 I lik this class beacus there is so meny teachers (2)

028 It is pertty nice to have all of the teachers we have (2)

029 I like it a lot ... I would chouse this class! (2)

031 I don't want to be in combo class .. I want some of the teachers to be with the other class. (3)

032 it's a pretty cool class and so are the teachers. (3)

033 It stinks (3)

035 The cool downs don't work they Just make you even madder. (3)

037 I got a sitation on the bus and what I did was self defence!!!!!!!!!.? (3)

Addendum D
Sociometric Data Regarding the Students with E/BD in the Combination Class

Table 3. Sociometric scores for students with emotional or behavior disorders[a]

	Student									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
How well known?	-1.93	-2.25	-2.01	0.00	-0.64	-0.16	-0.96	-1.24	-0.19	-2.13
Rejection	1.68	1.95	1.13	-0.26	1.40	-0.26	0.85	0.85	0.30	0.52
Popularity	-1.91	-2.22	-0.05	-0.36	0.26	0.88	-0.36	-0.98	-0.67	-0.31
Cooperative	-0.84	-2.00	-0.84	-0.88	-0.84	-0.02	-0.84	-0.84	-0.56	-0.68
Disruptive	2.11	1.74	-0.13	-0.88	1.36	-1.25	1.36	0.24	0.24	0.19
Dependent	2.91	1.80	-0.99	0.69	0.13	0.13	1.24	-0.43	-0.43	0.43
Acts Shy	1.80	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.39	-0.25	0.98	1.80	-0.66	2.26
Starts Fights	0.66	1.68	-0.86	-1.36	0.66	0.66	2.18	2.18	0.66	0.72
Leader	-0.24	-0.24	-0.93	-0.93	1.15	-0.24	-0.24	-0.24	-0.24	-0.93
Comedian	-0.76	-1.22	-0.30	-0.76	0.62	1.54	0.16	-0.76	-0.62	-1.14

aScores represent Z scores based upon same sex peer rating for "How well known?", frequency of "1" ratings for "Rejection", and same sex peer nominations for the remaining 8 items.

Table 4. Highest Z scores in a positive direction for students with emotional or behavior disorder and total sample (in parenthesis) on each item.

	Student									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
How well known?				0.00(1.20)						
Rejection				-0.26(-1.36)		-0.26(-1.36)				
Popularity						0.88(1.82)				
Cooperative						-0.02(2.04)				
Disruptive						-1.25(-1.25)				
Dependent			-0.99(-1.54)							
Acts Shy									-0.66(-1.49)	
Starts Fights				-1.36(-1.36)						
Leader					1.15(2.55)					
Comedian						1.54(2.92)				

Table 5. Peer perceived problems of students with emotional or behavior disorders in the combo class[a]

	Student									
	A	B	C[b]	D	E	F	G	H	I	J[b]
How well known?	X	X	X				c	X		X
Rejection	X	X	X		X					
Popular	X	X						c		
Cooperative		X								
Disruptive	X	X			X		X			
Dependent	X	X					X			
Acts Shy	X	c	c	c	X		c	X		X
Starts Fights		X					X	X		
Leader			c	c						c
Comedian		X		X						

[a] "X" = Z score was greater than 1.00 standard deviation deviant (i.e., different from the mean in a negative direction); "c" = Z score was .90 to .99 standard deviations deviant.

[b] Students "C" and "J" were the students with emotional or behavior disorders who were most recently placed into the combo class